

**Table 14** Summary of ML-based Admission Control

Ref.	ML Technique	Network	Dataset	Features	Output	Evaluation Settings	Results
Hiramatsu [189, 190]	Supervised: NN	ATM	Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link capacity</li> <li>Observed call generation rate</li> </ul>	Call loss rate	2-10-1 <sup>a</sup>	Improved call loss rate
Cheng and Chang [95]	Supervised: MLP-NN	ATM	Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Congestion-status</li> <li>Cell-loss probability</li> <li>Peak bitrate</li> <li>Average bitrate</li> <li>Mean peak-rate duration</li> </ul>	Acceptance or rejection	30-30-1 <sup>a</sup>	20% system utilization improvement over [189]
Piamrat et al. [359]	Supervised: RandNN	Wireless	Videos (distorted) generated by streaming application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Codec, bandwidth, delay, and jitter</li> </ul>	MOS	N/A	N/A
Baldo et al. [36]	Supervised: MLP-NN	Wireless LAN	ns-3 simulator and testbed	Link load and frame loss	Service quality	9-10-1 <sup>a</sup>	98.5% (offline) 92% (online)
Liu et al. [281]	Supervised: MLP-NN	Cellular (CDMA)	Simulation of cellular networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Network environment</li> <li>User behavior</li> <li>Call class</li> </ul>	GoS	5-10-1 <sup>a</sup>	Performs better than the static algorithms
Bojovic et al. [66]	Supervised: MLP-NN	Cellular (LTE)	ns-3 network simulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application throughput</li> <li>QoS fulfillment ratio</li> <li>Average packet error rate</li> <li>Average size of packet data unit</li> </ul>	QoS	N/A	Accuracy: 86%
Vassis et al. [452]	Supervised: Probabilistic LVO-NN	Ad hoc networks	Panovitis simulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Network throughput</li> <li>Packet generation rate</li> </ul>	Average packet delays	N/A	Correctness: 77% - 88% (Probabilistic RBFNN) Others do not converge
Ahn et al. [8]	Un-Supervised: HNN	Wireless network	Simulation	Usable QoS levels	QoS assignment matrix for each connection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N x M, where N are the number of connections and M is the number of QoS levels</li> </ul>	Minimized connection blocking and dropping probabilities
Blenk et al. [63]	Supervised: RNN	VN	Simulation	Different graph features	Acceptance or rejection of VN	18 different Recurrent NNs	89% - 98%
Bojovic et al. [67]	Supervised: NN	Cellular (LTE) network	ns-3 simulator	Channel quality indicator	R-factor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two layers with Number of nodes in the hidden layer: 10 and 20</li> </ul>	Accuracy: 98% (BN)
Quer et al. [372]	Supervised: BN	Wireless LAN	ns-3 simulator	Link Layer conditions	Voice call quality	Nodes: 9; Links: 14	Accuracy: 95%
Mignanti et al. [311]	RL: Q-learning	NGN	OMNET simulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States</li> <li>Environment state based on number of active connections of each traffic class</li> </ul>	Action	Not provided	10%-30% better than a greedy approach
Wang et al. [458]	RL: Q-learning	LTE femtocell networks	Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States</li> <li>Queue length of handoff and new calls</li> </ul>	Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain, degrade, or upgrade proportion levels</li> </ul>	Reduction in blocking probability
Tong et al. [446]	RL: Q-learning	Multimedia networks	Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States</li> <li>The number of incoming calls of each class</li> <li>Call arrival or termination event</li> <li>QoS and capacity constraints</li> </ul>	Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept or reject or no action</li> </ul>	Improvement in rejection rates
Marbach et al. [295]	RL: TD(0)	Integrated service network	Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States</li> <li>The number of calls of each class</li> <li>Routing path of each active call</li> </ul>	Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept with a route or reject</li> </ul>	2.2% improvement in rewards